

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

On January 10, 2006, a telephonic interview was conducted between the Examiner and the Applicant's Representative, Michael J. Musella. Although no agreement was reached, it is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner would reconsider several issues that were raised during the interview.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Jung et al. (U.S. 6,097,949) in view of Lietsalmi et al. (U.S. 6,370,391 B1).

It is respectfully submitted that Jung in view of Lietsalmi et al. does not teach using a message header and also converting the actual contents of the broadcasting information into a predetermined code.

Column 2, lines 11-24 and 33-67 of Lietsalmi et al. is cited as teaching the above recitation. These sections recite that the “**Broadcast Message category field**” is coded to provide a number of different types of message category identifiers.” Therefore, only a “category identifier” is coded, not any actual message content.

Further, lines 55-56 clearly recite that the index message is a special type of broadcast message that **contains general information** about the broadcast information, i.e., does not include the converted broadcasting information. Again, only “general information” is coded, not any actual message content.

The above referenced sections of Lietsalmi et al. recite coding a “category field” and “general information”, **not** the coding of a message itself.

Further, the teaching of Lietsalmi of using an index message is **not** an equivalent of the predetermined code of the converted message contents.

Additionally, no reference has been provided that teaches converting the broadcasting information to a predetermined message code **according to type and content** of the broadcasting


information. The index message of Lietsalmi is only determined by a type of information, because that is all Lietsalmi et al. is concerned with, not by type and contents of the broadcasting information, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 3, and 5 cannot be rendered unpatentable over the Jung in view of Lietsalmi et al. under §103(a).

It is respectfully submitted that the dependent Claims 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are allowable based on allowance of their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the earliest convenience to discuss the present application. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
TEL: (516) 228-8484
FAX: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr